

Soviet Minorities

I read with great interest your editorials on the national problem of the Soviet Union. It is obvious that the nationalities are the Achilles heel of the U. S. S. R. and, therefore, our natural ally.

Although, as you said on November 4, "Americans who attempt to study this problem will find it almost incredibly complicated," and we will add—intentionally obscured by Russian professors and politicians to the benefit of the Holy Russian Empire—your information was for the greater part correct.

It is true, as you said July 26, that the Russians (Muscovites) are a minority of the population of the Soviet Union, which is formally a union of multinational states. Indeed, the word "Russia" used so widely and improperly in this country disappeared from the official title of the Soviet Union 35 years ago. The Red Russians are busy Russianizing the non-Russian majority of the Soviet Union in the same way that the Czarist regime did. You stated correctly that the Ukrainian people are of a different culture and character than the Russians, having been forced for centuries to struggle for the preservation of their national identity and political independence in the face of the brutal Russian methods which even include genocide.

The name of the ancient Kievan state was improperly translated from the old Ukrainian "Rus" to the Ukraine and even today remains in use in some of the conservative regions of Ukraine. Therefore, the culture of the Kievan state was not Russian as you state in your November 4 editorial, but was the earliest form of Ukrainian culture.

Today's Russia is synonymous with Muscovy, which emerged as late as the twelfth century in the north-eastern colonial territories of the old Rus-Ukrainian empire. Inhabited by a population of a different culture and even partially of a non-Slavic ethnical origin, it was only superficially civilized by the Kievan civilization, and therefore, naturally separated itself from the ethnically Ukrainian south when the Kievan Empire was weakened by the invasions of the barbarians from Asia. By culture and spirit Kiev was always a part of Europe—Moscow a part of Asia as the Russian writer Alexey Tolstoy himself stated in the nineteenth century. Moscow as a subservient vassal of the Mongolian empire increased its power,

adopted the Mongolian methods of government and developed successfully its ambition to absorb its former ruler—Ukraine.

Ukraine, however, stubbornly fought for its freedom and independence, taking advantage of every opportunity to throw off the yoke of Moscow. In 1917 the revolution which in Russia was a purely social revolution, became a liberation revolution on the territories of the non-Russian peoples. Ukraine, as early as January 22, 1918, declared its independence from Russia, and one year later, after the downfall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, brought about the unification of all its territories (western and eastern) on January 22, 1919. These acts of independence and unification were brought about through democratically elected representatives of the Ukrainian people.

They evoked such strong support from the Ukrainian masses that the Bolsheviks, after occupying Ukraine by force and communization, were unable to revert to the restoration of a one and indivisible Russia, but were forced to transform the former Russian empire into a union of Soviet Republics, granting Ukraine a constitutional right to secede from the Union. In order to satisfy the Ukrainians, Stalin was forced to introduce Ukraine as a member of the United Nations (1946). These are historical facts which do not contradict but rather supplement your statements.

We cannot, however, agree with the conclusions drawn in your editorial "Russians and Ukrainians" of November 3. They contradict your previous assertions. In the face of these historical facts where is the logic of the principle of non-predetermination created by the American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism? The fate of the former Russian Empire was decided in 1918-19. The indivisible Russian Empire no longer exists. The Russian (Muscovite) Republic exists today in association with 15 other national Republics in the Soviet Union. Two other Republics (Ukraine and Byelorussia) are even members of the United Nations. Red Moscow, of course, through the centralization of the Communist Party, exercises dictatorial control throughout the Soviet Union. The Ukrainian people are enslaved by the Russian Communists in their own republic, but despite this there exists no problem of a repetition of the process of self-determination by

the non-Russian peoples. The only problem is how to install the governments chosen by the people themselves. The same problem exists also in the satellite countries of Moscow.

Mr. Kerensky and his followers have been politically asleep for the past 35 years if they still dream of the one and indivisible Russian empire. This dream is totally unrealistic and contrary to the trend of modern history, which brought about the dissolution of all empires—even those built on primitive territories.

If the American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism chooses to ignore the clearly expressed will of the Soviet peoples, and the millions of victims fallen in their century-long struggle for liberation, it will only create for itself sisyphian work. Of course, it will in this way win the favor of bankrupt Russian imperialist exiles, but it never will unify the representatives of the nations of the Soviet Union for the struggle against America's worst enemy—Soviet Russia.

NICHOLAS CHUBATY,
Editor, The Ukrainian Quarterly,
New York.

CPYRGHT

Editor's Notes: (1) The quarrel here seems mainly one of terminology. According to best authorities, the names Rhosia and Rhus were first employed by the Byzantine Greeks to designate the territory and the inhabitants of the old Kingdom of Kiev, who in the time of St. Vladimir the Great (c. A.D. 956-1015) were converted to the Orthodox form of Christianity. Thus Dr. Chubaty is correct in stating that "by culture and spirit Kiev was always part of Europe," if by "Europe" is meant the Graeco-Roman and Christian traditions. Similarly, the terms Ruthene and Ruthenian, employed to designate the Galician and Carpatho-Ukrainians, and sometimes the Ruthenian (Uniat) Catholic Church, are derived from a Latinized form of "Russian."

(2) The conclusion in the editorial of November 3, from which Dr. Chubaty dissents, was simply that the political destiny of the Ukrainian peoples, after the presumptive fall of communism, is for Ukrainians themselves, and not for Americans or for either Russo-Americans or Ukrainian-Americans to decide. This was the position taken by the American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism, which now finds itself caught in the middle of the controversy between Mr. Kerensky and other Great (Muscovite) Russian emigrees on the one side and the Ukrainian-American groups on the other.